

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on September 10, 2007. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action, claims 1-52 were pending. By the way of the present response applicants have: (1) amended no claims; (2) canceled no claims; and (3) added no claims. As such, claims 1-52 are now pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11, 14, 17-20, 23, 25-34, 37, 40, 43-46, 49, 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2002/0184091 by Nick J. Pudar (hereinafter "Pudar"). Applicants respectfully submit that Pudar does not disclose every element and limitation recited in independent claims 1 and 27. More specifically, while independent claims 1 and 27 of the present application recite limitations pertaining to a method and system for **multicasting an event of interest** upon the detection of such an event, Pudar discloses a method and system for playing previously stored advertising upon the detection of an advertising slot marker, pre-selected by the radio channel.

Independent claims 1 and 27, respectively, recite:

1. A method for **multicasting an event of interest**, the method comprises the steps of:
 - detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream; and
 - multicasting at least one media stream of interest** that comprises the event of interest.

27. A system for **multicasting an event of interest**, the method comprises the steps of:
 - means for detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream; and means for **multicasting at least one media stream of interest** that comprises the event of interest.

In contrast, Pudar discloses:

“A radio broadcast system includes a vehicle-based radio system that receives radio broadcasts via digital satellite transmission from a transmitting facility and provides two-way communication with a vehicle communications central facility. The vehicle system includes a radio broadcast receiver, a vehicle radio, an advertising control unit, and a vehicle communications device. The transmitting facility broadcasts a number of different channels of programming content (music, news, etc.) along with one or more separate streams of radio advertisements, all of which are received by the radio broadcast receiver. The received advertisements are provided to the advertising control unit which selects certain advertisements targeted to the vehicle user based on user or vehicle data and stores the selected advertisements on a recording device that is included with the advertising control unit. The broadcasted radio streams received by the vehicle system contain intermittent advertising slots and the system monitors the channel selected by the vehicle operator for markers that identify these advertising slots. Once a marker is detected, the advertising control unit accesses one of the stored advertisements from the recording device and provides the accessed advertisement to the receiver for insertion into the advertising slot. Confirmation of the playback of an advertisement is provided by communication back to the central facility which permits billing of advertisers on a per-listen basis.”

(Pudar, Abstract)

Claims 1 and 27 of the present application disclose in part “**detecting an occurrence of an event of interest within a received media stream; and multicasting at least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of interest.**” In contrast, Pudar discloses “[t]he broadcasted radio streams... contain **intermittent advertising slots**... Once a **marker is detected**, the advertising control unit accesses one of the **stored advertisements**...” Pudar does not disclose the limitations pertaining to **multicasting** in general, much less **multicasting at least one media stream of interest that comprises the event of interest detected within a received media stream**.

Further, Pudar discloses using **predefined temporal slots** selected by a radio channel, which are “filled” with advertisements **stored in an individual receiver**. Pudar discloses a client side device and method associated with the selection of content/advertising for presentation on the client side device. In contrast, the claims of the present application are directed to generation of a “**multicast**” stream – e.g., steps and elements associated with a broadcaster.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Pudar does not disclose all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 27 and that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Given that claims 2-8, 11, 14, 17-20, 23, 25, 26, 28-34, 37, 40, 43-46, 49, 51 and 52 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, 11, 14, 17-20, 23, 25, 26, 28-34, 37, 40, 43-46, 49, 51 and 52 are not anticipated by Pudar under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 21-22, 24, 35-36, 38-39, 41-42, 47-48, 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of U.S. Patent Application 2004/0010588 by Slater et al (hereinafter "Slater"). Given that claims 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 21-22, 24, 35-36, 38-39, 41-42, 47-48, 50 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 21-22, 24, 35-36, 38-39, 41-42, 47-48, 50 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Slater.

Claims 10, 15, 36, and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of U.S. Patent Application 2003/0154490 by Ming-Chih Chang (hereinafter "Chang"). Given that claims 10, 15, 36, and 41 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 15, 36, and 41 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Chang.

Claims 12 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of U.S. Patent Application 20030051241 by Klosterman et al. (hereinafter "Klosterman"). Given that claims 12 and 38 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 and 38 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Klosterman.

Claims 13 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of U.S. Patent Application 20030185546 by Atsushi Hirota (hereinafter

“Hirota”). Given that claims 13 and 39 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 and 39 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Hirota.

Claims 16 and 42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of Chang and further in view of U.S. Patent Application 2004/0034875 by Bulkowski (hereinafter “Bulkowski”). Given that claims 16 and 42 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 16 and 42 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Chang and further in view of Bulkowski.

Claims 21 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of U.S. Patent Application 2004/0083488 by Fukuda et al. (hereinafter “Fukuda”). Given that claims 21 and 47 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 21 and 47 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Fukuda.

Claims 22 and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of U.S. Patent Application 2002/0170058 Cheng-Chia Chang (hereinafter “Chang C.”). Given that claims 22 and 48 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 22 and 48 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Chang C.

Claims 24 and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Pudar in view of U.S. Patent 6,671,736 by Virine et al. (hereinafter “Virine”). Given that claims 24 and 50 depend from independent claims 1 and 27 and add additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 24 and 50 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pudar in view of Virine.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Applicants reserve all rights under the doctrine of equivalents.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant hereby requests and authorizes the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 02/11/2008



Lester J. Vincent
Reg. No. 31,460

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300